

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

CHRISTOPHER SADOWSKI,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 22-cv-334-KG-JHR

CONSTRUCTION REPORTER
DIGITAL MAGAZINE, LLC;
CONSTRUCTION REPORTER LLC,

Defendants.

SUMMARY ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Christopher Sadowski's Motion to Stay (Doc. 33). Defendants timely filed a Response in opposition (Doc. 35). At first blush, a stay in this case would seem to be consistent with the notion of judicial economy and the stay granted in *Adler Medical LLC et al v. Harrington*, No. 22-cv-072-KG-LF, however on closer examination of this case and the distinctions between it and *Adler*, and having fully considered the briefing and applicable law, the Court is not persuaded that a stay is appropriate in this case.

Mr. Sadowski presents two arguments for the stay: (1) that this case is analogous to *Adler*, where the Court entered a stay related to similar Motion to Disqualify, and (2) judicial economy. *Generally* (Doc. 33). The Court summarily denies the Motion to Stay because: (1) it finds *Adler Medical* distinguishable in numerous ways, including that the parties and facts are distinct and that there the parties agreed to the stay, *see Adler*, (Doc. 91); and (2) judicial economy is insufficient to amount to a "strong showing of necessity," hardship, or inequity justifying a stay, *Commodity Futures Trading Comm'n v. Chilcott Portfolio Mgmt., Inc.*, 713

F.2d 1477, 1484 (10th Cir. 1983). The Motion to Stay is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE